



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,900	07/11/2000	IAN E. SMITH	XER1P006	9960

25696 7590 05/10/2005

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY  
P. O. BOX 10356  
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER
----------

LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/613,900

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Christian La Forgia

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7, 10, 14, 21, 24, 28, 35, 38 and 42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29-34, 36, 37, 39-41, 43-45 and 49-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 46-48 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed on 22 February 2005 has been noted and made of record.
2. Claims 1-51 have been presented for examination.
3. Claims 7, 10, 14, 21, 24, 28, 35, 38 and 42 have been cancelled as per Applicant's request.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15-20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29-34, 36, 37, 39-41, and 42-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
5. See further rejections that follow.

### ***Claim Rejections***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
8. Claims 1-3, 8, 11, 15-17, 22, 25, 29-31, 36, 39, and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,425,002 to Zurcher et al., hereinafter Zurcher.

Art Unit: 2131

9. As per claims 1, 15, and 29, Zurcher teaches a computerized method of operating an e-mail-invoked application server comprising the steps of:

receiving an incoming e-mail message from a sender utilizing a network, wherein the incoming e-mail includes content and a destination address having an address format (column 2, lines 35-43; column 2, line 66 to 3, line 3, column 3, lines 41-42, column 5, lines 52-65 i.e. inbound messages, e-mail messages, SMS messages, internet messages);

determining which application of a plurality of applications available on the e-mail invoked application server will accept the incoming e-mail for processing by comparing message attributes (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 29, i.e. “determining whether the inbound message is to be delivered to one application or the other application or both applications”);

refusing the incoming e-mail when it is determined that no application will accept the incoming e-mail for processing (column 3, lines 48-52, column 4, lines 11-16, column 6, lines 9-33 i.e. declaring a message not handled); and

invoking at least one of a plurality of applications to process the content of the incoming e-mail when it is determined that the attributes are acceptable as defined by the at least one - application (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 29, column 5, lines 17-40). Zurcher discloses making a determination based on message attributes, which include the address format as indicated by column 3, lines 35-38, specifically under the definition of Message as including addressing information necessary to deliver the data and optionally additional attributes.

10. Regarding claims 2, 16, and 30, Zurcher teaches storing at least a portion of the incoming e-mail message in a database (column 3, lines 12-15, column 7, lines 22-30).

11. Regarding claims 3, 17, and 31, Zurcher teaches wherein the at least one application is selected from the group consisting of a lead tracking application, a job requisitioning application, an event planning application, a task list management application, a project management application, and an accountability application (column 2, lines 35-43). Microsoft Outlook and Lotus Notes both provide functions for event planning, a task list, project management and accountability.

12. Regarding claims 8, 22, and 36, Zurcher teaches wherein the at least one application invoked by the incoming email generates an event to advance the processing of a task (column 7, lines 2-23).

13. Regarding claims 11, 25, and 39, Zurcher teaches wherein the e-mail message includes an attachment (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 29, column 5, lines 17-40). Zurcher discloses making a determination based on message attributes, which include the attachments as indicated by column 3, lines 35-38.

14. Concerning claims 43, 44, and 45, Zurcher teaches wherein the step of invoking at least one application is responsive to the attachment (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 29, column 5, lines 17-40). Zurcher discloses making a determination based on message attributes, which include the attachments as indicated by column 3, lines 35-38.

Art Unit: 2131

15. Claims 4-6, 9, 18-20, 23, 32-34, 37, and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zurcher in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,689 to Raghunandan, hereinafter Raghunandan.

16. Regarding claims 4, 18, and 32, Zurcher does not disclose wherein the at least one application invoked by the incoming email generates a reply to the incoming e-mail to advance the processing of a task.

17. Raghunandan teaches wherein the at least one application invoked by the incoming email generates a reply to the incoming e-mail to advance the processing of a task (column 1, lines 57-67).

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate a reply to the incoming e-mail to advance the processing of a task, since Raghunandan discloses at column 1, lines 62-67 that such a modification provides for a vigorous discussion between the original sender and all of the recipients.

19. Regarding claims 5, 19, and 33, Zurcher does not disclose wherein the at least one application summarizes an interaction between one or more users of the e-mail invoked application server.

20. Raghunandan teaches wherein the at least one application summarizes an interaction between one or more users of the e-mail invoked application server (column 2, lines 48-58).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to summarize an interaction between users, since Raghunandan discloses at column 2,

Art Unit: 2131

lines 9-18 that such a technique would supplement e-mail tools with powerful facilities so as to enable optimal utilization of internet bandwidth.

22. With regards to claims 6, 20, and 34, Zurcher does not disclose wherein a task list is generated to summarize the interaction.

23. Raghunandan teaches wherein a task list is generated to summarize the interaction (column 2, lines 48-58).

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate a task list, since Raghunandan discloses at column 2, lines 9-18 that such a technique would supplement e-mail tools with powerful facilities so as to enable optimal utilization of internet bandwidth.

25. With regards to claims 9, 23, and 37, Zurcher does not disclose wherein a reply to the e-mail message is utilized to generate another e-mail message to obtain information for the database.

26. Raghunandan teaches wherein a reply to the e-mail message is utilized to generate another e-mail message to obtain information for the database (column 1, lines 57-67).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate another e-mail message to obtain information for the database, since Raghunandan discloses at column 1, lines 62-67 that such a modification provides for a vigorous discussion between the original sender and all of the recipients.

Art Unit: 2131

28. Regarding claims 49-51, Zurcher does not disclose determining a recipient email address of an actual recipient of the incoming e-mail; and transmitting the incoming e-mail message to the recipient email address utilizing the network.

29. Raghunandan teaches determining a recipient email address of an actual recipient of the incoming e-mail; and transmitting the incoming e-mail message to the recipient email address utilizing the network (column 2, lines 1-9).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include e-mail aliasing, since Raghunandan states at column 2, lines 1-9 that such a modification would facilitate identification and reduce the burden of repeatedly entering individual e-mail addresses.

31. Claims 12, 13, 26, 27, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zurcher in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,546 to Biliris et al., hereinafter Biliris.

32. Regarding claims 12, 26, and 40, Zurcher does not disclose generating an index based on the one or more attributes of the incoming e-mail message; and storing the index in a database.

33. Biliris teaches generating an index based on the one or more attributes of the incoming e-mail message; and storing the index in a database (column 6, lines 41-62).

34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate an index based on the one or more attributes of the incoming e-mail message and store the index in a database, since Biliris discloses at column 1, lines 27-35 that



Art Unit: 2131

such a modification would allow a messaging system to easily define and modify message attributes.

35. Regarding claims 13, 27, and 41, Zurcher does not disclose storing the incoming e-mail messages in a database; categorizing the content of the incoming e-mail messages into one or more categories, and permitting retrieval of the information from the database according to at least one of the one or more categories

36. Biliris teaches storing the incoming e-mail messages in a database; categorizing the content of the incoming e-mail messages into one or more categories, and permitting retrieval of the information from the database according to at least one of the one or more categories (column 6, lines 7-29).

37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the incoming e-mail messages in a database; categorize the content of the incoming e-mail messages into one or more categories, and permit retrieval of the information from the database according to at least one of the one or more categories, since Biliris discloses at column 1, lines 27-35 that such a modification would allow a messaging system to easily define and modify message attributes.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

38. Claims 46-48 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

*Conclusion*

39. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

40. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

41. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (571) 272-3792. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

42. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2131

43. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christian LaForgia  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2131

clf

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100